

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

KAI D. INGRAM,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	Civil No. 22-42
)	Judge Marilyn J. Horan/
v.)	Magistrate Judge Patricia L. Dodge
)	
B. RUDZIENSKI, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

Presently before the Court is Kai D. Ingram’s Motion for Reconsideration (ECF No. 82) of this Court’s December 12, 2023 Order (ECF No. 76) denying Mr. Ingram’s Appeal of the Magistrate Judge’s denial of Mr. Ingram’s Motion to Compel a video recording of his April 23, 2021 disciplinary hearing. The Defendants have filed a Response opposing reconsideration, citing the same reasons proffered by the Magistrate Judge in her initial ruling on the Motion to Compel, and by this Court in denying the Appeal. ECF No. 86. Said reasons are: the evidence Mr. Ingram seeks to compel, a video recording of his April 23, 2021 disciplinary hearing, does not exist, and the video recording is not relevant to any remaining claims in the case.

Mr. Ingram seeks reconsideration arguing that the Magistrate Judge’s Order denying his Motion to Compel erroneously concerned the video recording of his April 23, 2021 disciplinary hearing. Mr. Ingram claims that he actually sought to compel a video recording dated April 16, 2021, which was the date he was issued the misconduct that was the basis for the April 23, 2021 disciplinary hearing. It appears that Mr. Ingram seeks the video recording to show that he is innocent of the misconduct charges by allegedly showing that Defendant Lynch falsely manufactured the misconducts. Upon his initial appeal to this Court Mr. Ingram did not mention

that he sought a video recording dated April 16, 2021. *See* ECF No. 72. Nor did Mr. Ingram refer to an April 16, 2021 recording when he motioned the magistrate judge to compel discovery items. ECF No. 70. The Motion for Reconsideration will be denied because the item Mr. Ingram refers to was not raised before the Magistrate Judge and was not at issue when this Court ruled on Mr. Ingram's Appeal. Additionally, the Motion for Reconsideration will be denied because the subject matter of both the April 16, 2021 video recording (if such recording exists) and the April 23, 2021 video recording (which recording does not exist) concern the issue of Mr. Ingram's misconduct, and said matters are no longer at issue in this case.

And NOW, this 30th day of January 2024, it is ORDERED that Kai D. Ingram's Motion for Reconsideration, ECF No. 86, is DENIED.

s/Marilyn J. Horan
Marilyn J. Horan
United States District Judge

cc: Kai D. Ingram, pro se
HC8003
SCI-GREENE
169 PROGRESS DRIVE
WAYNESBURG, PA 15370